

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Gerald J. Raymond, Jr.,	)	Case No. 6:23-cv-06921-DCC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Steve Mueller,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
<hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>	)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's pro se Complaint. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). The Magistrate Judge directed Plaintiff to complete certain documents to bring this case into proper form and further directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint to correct certain identified errors. ECF Nos. 7, 12, 16. Plaintiff responded to the proper form orders but did not file an amended complaint.

On March 11, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with an order of the court. ECF No. 21. The Magistrate Judge further notes that this action would be subject to summary dismissal. The Magistrate Judge advised the Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report

and the serious consequences for failing to do so. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report, and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice, without leave to amend, and without issuance of service of process pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.  
United States District Judge

April 29, 2024  
Spartanburg, South Carolina

